

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants Attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference of March 1, 2006. Applicants also wish to thank the Examiner for the time in reconsidering the claims and the reconsideration of Applicants' remarks regarding claims 49-53 and 56. After the in-person interview, Applicants believed that the remaining claims 49-53 and 56 are allowable for the reasons discussed and these reasons are again set forth below.

New claims 57 and 58 are directed to already allowed subject matter stated to be allowable with respect to claim 24 in the previous action and as such, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance for this reason.

Also as discussed with the Examiner, Applicants, instead of having the Examiner make corrections to claims 49, 50 and 53 by Examiner's Amendment, have amended these claims to correct typographical errors.

As noted below, the claims are in condition for allowance since the RAMDAC in Zenda cannot be equated to the claimed video memory since FIG. 26 of Zenda shows that the RAMDAC 23 and video memory (VRAM) are different components, as known in the art. In addition, the claims require, among other things, a plurality of screen memories wherein each of the screen memories store separate display data and a display controller retrieves the display data from the screen memories. The RAMDAC in Zenda also is merely a device that converts display data into color data and there is no display controller that retrieves display data from the RAMDAC as display data is sent to the RAMDAC. Accordingly, the Zenda reference was previously misinterpreted.

As to claim 49, Applicants also note that the single video graphic card in the claim employs a plurality of display controllers that retrieve display data from the screen memory

portion. In contrast, the Zenda reference describes its card as including only a single display board and only includes a single display controller. Accordingly, Zenda does not teach what is alleged in the office action and accordingly, the claim is in condition for allowance.

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the notice that claims 24, 29-32, 33 and 38-48 are allowed. Applicants have also added new claims 57 and 58 which are directed to a video graphics processing circuit and method setting forth the operations stated to be allowable in view of the cited references in the “Allowable Subject Matter” section. As such, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Remaining claims 49-53 and 56 stand rejected. Claims 49, 50 and 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Zenda. The office action alleges that the claimed screen memory that comprises a plurality of screen memory portions that each stores display data for the plurality of displays are RAMDACs 93 and 111. However, Applicants respectfully submit that a RAMDAC is merely a random access memory digital to analog converter as known in the art that maintains, for example, the color palette and converts data from memory into analog signals for the monitor. As such, Zenda also discloses VRAM which is described as actually storing the display data. The claims are in condition for allowance at least since the RAMDACs 93 and 111 are not a plurality of screen memory portions as claimed that store display data.

Moreover, Applicants claim a plurality of display controllers included on a single video graphics card. The office action alleges that first display controller 87 and second display controller 109 are the claimed plurality of display controllers included on a single video graphics card. However, Applicants respectfully wish to point out that FIG. 3a specifically describes a completely different structure from that claimed. In fact, FIG. 3a specifically shows that the

display controllers 87, 109 are in fact are not on a single video graphics card but instead one is in the portable computer main body and the other is in an LCD display board. (See for example, right portion of FIG. 3a). As such, the cited portion of Zenda also fails to anticipate Applicants' claimed invention and therefore these claims are in condition for allowance for this reason also. Other differences will also be recognized by those of ordinary skill in the art.

The dependent claims add additional novel and non-obvious subject matter.

Claims 51 and 52 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Zenda in view of Ranganathan. Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to the Zenda reference and as such, these claims are also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 56, Applicants respectfully reassert the relevant remarks made above with respect to the Zenda reference and accordingly this claim is also in condition for allowance.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below-listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/10/06

By: Christopher J. Reckamp
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 N. LaSalle Street
Chicago, IL 60601
(312) 609-7500
FAX: (312) 609-5005